

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

The claims are 2-13, with claims 7 and 11 being amended

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 4-8, 10-11 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over International Application No. WO/00/48937 to Han et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,750,429 to Mordaunt et al.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Han et al. in view of Mordaunt et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,897,011 to Brower.

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Han et al. in view of Mordaunt et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,799 to Pardes.

Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Han et al. in view of Mordaunt et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,926,126 to Voss.

It is respectfully submitted that the remaining claims are patentable over the above cited references taken either singly or in combination because none of the above references contain the following feature recited above:

b) at least one support surface disposed below said lower trolley tracks;

Support for this amendment can be found in the specification on page 11 line 17. In addition examples of a support surface are shown in FIGS. 4-7 as well. The support surface is positioned below the lower track so that it can be used to allow the trolley to lift itself either above the lower track or above the upper track. The integrated lifting system is configured to lift the trolley off of either the lower track or the upper track via the integrated lifting system contacting this support surface below the lower track. The positioning of this lower support surface allows the trolley to have a compact structure which does

not require upper extending arms such as that shown in Mourdant et al, which discloses high level followers 31 (See column 5 lines 65-68). The upper extending arms which extend up to a support surface 44, or 45 (see column 6 lines 52-59) would be detrimental to the present design. This is because if the present invention had arms extending to a support surface above the upper track, the system of the present invention would not allow two different trolleys to cross each other, with one trolley being above the other. The disclosure of Mourdant et al. is not concerned with this feature because with Mourdant et al. The tracks run transverse to each other. (See column 6 lines 60-66).

Because none of the above references cited either alone or in combination contain all of the features of the present invention as claimed in claim 11, it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is patentable over the above cited references taken either singularly or in combination. In addition, because it is respectfully submitted that claim 11 is allowable, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-10 and 12-13 are allowable as well.

Therefore, early allowance of the remaining claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Otto WEIS

/William Collard/

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802

William C. Collard 38, 411
Edward R. Freedman, Reg.No.26,048
Attorneys for Applicant

WCC

R:\Patents\W\WEIS, O. - 2 PCT\amend7-11-08.wpd